[10191/538]

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Applicants** 

Marko MASCHEK et al.

Serial No.

08/963,720

Filed

November 4, 1997

For

PROCESS FOR GENERATING COLLISION SIGNALS

Examiner

Jacques H. Louis-Jacques certify that this correspondence is being deposited with

Art Unit :

the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an env lope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington,

D.C. 20231, on

Art Omt

3661

Dated: 9/9/99

Reg. 41,172

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Weshington, D.C. 2023.1

Washington, D.C. 20231

Signature.

O,g....-. = =

**RESPONSE** 

DERVIS MAGISTRE KENYON & KENYO**N** 🗡

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated June 9, 1999, reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks 500

## **REMARKS**

SEP 1 5 1999

Claims 1-6 remain pending in this application and are submitted for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 4-6 include allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In pointing out the supposed the deficiencies of this claim, the Examiner makes two points. First, the Examiner asserts that "it is not clear whether the 'simulated signal segments' are being combined or whether they become inputs to the overall transmission function." Next, the Examiner asserts that the "step of 'simulating...' becomes 'useless' since the result of the simulating step does not affect the steps of 'combining ' and 'forming'. Office Action at page 3. Utility of claim limitations, however, is not the appropriate standard for evaluating claim limitations under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2. Claim limitations are to be evaluated under this statute by the standard of "whether those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed when the claim is read in light of the specification." The Beachcombers, International v. WildeWood Creative Products, 31